



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie, von Dr. THEODOR ZIELIŃSKI.
Leipzig, 1885.

In an article on the Agon of the Old Comedy (*Am. Journal of Philology*, Vol. VIII, No. 2) I expressed a purpose to publish a second article on the same subject, and then to review the work of Zieliński. Unavoidable delay has rendered it necessary to combine the two articles, which is not to be regretted, inasmuch as I had very little to say not found in Zieliński. The article just referred to indicated sufficiently his views with regard to the Agon, except that the question of the absence of that part from three comedies of Aristophanes was deferred for future consideration. This part of his work we will now take up.

As the plays which have no Agon may have lost it through a revision, Z. very properly opens the discussion with an examination of the one play which all concede to have been revised—the *Clouds*. The essential part of Z.'s conclusions agrees with what has already been recognized as indisputable: that the Agon of the original play has been removed, but portions of it are found in the revised play. He assumes the following propositions as already settled: 1. The extant play was never acted. 2. The whole Parabasis, the great Agon, and the closing scene, were not in the original play. 3. Vv. 110–120 have been inserted; vv. 731–739 form a dittography of vv. 723–730.

As to the scenery, he holds that the inside of the phrontistery is never seen. Where persons after entering are still in view, a yard (or garden) is meant. This theory removes some of the seeming inconsistencies which have been ascribed to the revision.

The principal change which the poet intended to make in the second play was this: in the first play the instruction of Strepsiades was successful; in the revised play it fails, in order that Pheidippides may be introduced. Hence the repetitions in the much discussed meditation scene, 694–803. In the original play it was an external inconvenience that was encountered—the bed-bugs; in the new play it was an internal, insuperable hindrance—sleepiness. In this, as in some other parts of the discussion, too much stress seems to be laid upon mere jokes. I see no evidence that Strepsiades was inclined to sleep at all, and any one who sees in 705 f. evidence to the contrary, must find Aristophanes very dreary. The humor of the situation is exquisite. Still the conclusions of Z. are not shaken by these minor considerations. He very properly disposes of the phallos difficulty by asserting that there was no phallos either in the first or in the second *Clouds*. But for the nonsense of a scholiast we should never have heard of a phallós in this play.

As further consequences of the theory maintained by Z., not only the great Agon, but also the secondary Agon between Strepsiades and Pheidippides, belongs alone to the revised play. That such is the case is shown by the allu-

sions to the play in Plato's *Apology* of Socrates, where it is clear that the charge of corrupting the young was not in the play as acted. Moreover, the secondary Agon is a mere echo of the great one. Elsewhere in his work Z. sets up the theory that the choric parts of each play are in the same rhythm, and that a revision always involved a change of the rhythm. This theory works well with his theory of the revision of the *Clouds*. The attempts of the author to remove the obstacles encountered by his theory, and also the discussion of the causes that induced Aristophanes to commence and to abandon the revision, though interesting and suggestive, I must pass over.

The Parodos of the *Clouds* is shown to be a piece of patchwork. It contains the *Epithesis*, or, as Z. calls it, the Epirrhema of the Agon¹ of the first *Clouds*. It is very similar to that of the *Birds*. In the lost *Antepithesis* or Antepirrhema, Chaos and the Tongue were no doubt added to the gods. Vv. 439-456 probably formed the *Epistasis* or Pnigos of the Agon, though a Parodos as such may have a Pnigos. The theoretical substance of the whole Agon is given by the author. The *Antode* is 457-475; the *Antikeleusma*, 476 f.

Thus we have an analogy after which we may judge other plays that may have been revised. The three plays without Agon are the *Acharnians*, *Eirene*, *Thesmophoriazousai*. We begin with the *Acharnians*. There is no tradition of a revision, but the play bears marks of one. We find very formal preparations for an important contest between Dikaiopolis and Lamachos; but when the latter actually appears the scene is a mere farce; and yet, when it is over, the Choros—the *whole* Choros too, although the Hemichoria were previously arrayed on opposite sides—says 'Ἀνὴρ νικᾷ τοῖσι λόγοισι. (These words, it is true, introduce the Parabasis, and of course do not constitute a formal *Krasis* or Sphragis.) Now, precisely this scene, 593-619, has already been recognized by some scholars as an insulated passage; and here alone, according to Z., Lamachos is strategos, being elsewhere lochagos. Especially do vv. 1071 ff. prove that he was lochagos or taxiarchos,² as all the generals would have been present at the council whence issued the orders here served on Lamachos.

Further, it will be remembered that the *Dialysis* or Epirrhimation is a pair of tristichs, each uttered by one of the antagonists. Now, if one compares the *Dialysis* of Lysistrata, 608-613, which immediately precedes the Parabasis, with the six verses that separate the insulated scene from the Parabasis in the *Acharnians*, it will be scarcely possible to doubt that these verses form the *Dialysis* of a formal Agon.

But how did the play get into its present form? The *Acharnians* received the first prize at the Lenaia. The poet probably began to revise it for a reperformance at the Great Dionysia—a thing which was actually done in the case of the *Frogs*—but for some reason abandoned the purpose. Changes of circumstances may have rendered the Agon inappropriate. This view is confirmed by the choric ode 1150 ff., where curses are imprecated upon Antimachos, ὅς ἐμὲ Λήναια χορηγῶν ἀπέκλεισε κτέ.

¹ The nomenclature of Z. is as follows: Ode, Katakeleusmos, Epirrhema, Pnigos; Antode, Antikatakeleusmos, Antepirrhema, Antipnigos; Sphragis, Epirrhimation.

² There is room for difference of opinion here, and Z.'s treatment is not wholly satisfactory. The plural λόγοι, he says, is used in 1073 because several δάμαχοι are mentioned, 1071. He disregards σέ in 1073, and makes no allusion to 575, ὦ δάμαχ' ἦρωσ, τῶν λόφων καὶ τῶν λόγων. Of 568 he says: "dass er verderbt ist, folgt schon aus dem gleichen Anfange mit v. 566." This last is a sample of a species of too positive inference which mars the book in not a few passages.

It must be confessed that there is a difficulty in the fact that this play in its present form offers no place for an Agon except where the insulated scene stands. Where, then, was the new Agon to be inserted? Or, if a revised play may dispense with the Agon, why not an original play? Still this difficulty is not insurmountable, and it may be regarded as highly probable that the play at first had an Agon.

Another play without Agon is Eirene. My own attempts to offer a plausible explanation of the present form of the play on the theory that it originally had an Agon, had proved fruitless. Zieliński's theory is exceedingly ingenious, and his discussion displays much acuteness; but still we feel that this is the weakest case in favor of the universal use of the Agon. I shall give a brief outline. There were two plays which bore the name *Ειρήνη*. That one of these was a revised form of the other, and that we have the revised play, is rendered probable by the allusions to Kleon, 268 ff., 313 ff., 647 ff., and, as Z. claims, 45 ff. Kleon was dead before the date assigned to the play. The objection that the play was nevertheless performed is not fatal; for the poet was vastly more likely to leave inconsistencies and inappropriate allusions in a revised play than he was to insert them in a new play. Another objection, however, appears more serious: it was performed as we have it, and it contains no Agon. But what if the play was reproduced, not as a comedy, but as the substitute for a festal oration (Festrede)? Such was, according to Z., actually the case. A statue of Eirene was to be dedicated, hence the figure that could not speak (657); it had been begun by Pheidias, hence the hitherto unexplained verse 605; the dedicatory ceremonies were real, hence they take place in full view (not behind the scenes) and in the presence of women (963 f.). In this last passage, however, some will see evidence that women were *not* there; and as to the statue representing Eirene, Z. disregards a serious difficulty. In favor of his view he cites Schol. Plat. 331 B, *κωμωδεῖται δὲ* ('*Ἀριστοφάνης*) ὅτι καὶ τὸ τῆς *Ειρήνης* κολοσσικὸν ἐξῆρεν (*ἐξῆρυν*?) ἄγαλμα, *Εὐπολὺς* *Αὐτολύκῳ*, *Πλάτων* *Νίκαις*. This does, indeed, show that Eirene was represented by a statue; but does it not disprove the theory that it was a statue of Pheidias, produced for the purpose of dedication? On the other hand, some of the details which I omit add strength to the theory.

Finally, there is no Agon in Thesmophoriazousai, except an insignificant *Epithesis* introduced by a *Keleusma*, 531 ff. The assumption that the two plays that bore this name were entirely distinct, rests on inadequate evidence. Moreover, the fact that the lost play is cited as *δεύτεραι* does not prove that it was chronologically subsequent. The designations *πρότεραι* or *α'*, *δεύτεραι* (*ἐπεραι*) or *β'*, are frequently used to denote respectively the well known play and the less known. This usage was not uniform; accordingly the lost Thesmophoriazousai (Frag. 334 K) is called *πρότεραι* by Hephaistion. Now, if one was a revision, it is *a priori* probable that it is the extant play. It will be seen that there are internal evidences that this is the case.

The lost play represented the last day of the Thesmophoria—the Kalligeneia; the extant play represents the middle day (Z. inadvertently says the third)—the Nesteia. This was a day of fasting, on which no sacrifices were offered; cf. Schol. Thesm. 376, and especially Ar. Av. 1519, *ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰ Θεσμοφορίαις νηστεύομεν*. | *ἀνεν θηγλῶν*. (Mika's wine bottle was smuggled in, and her food was partaken of stealthily.) And yet Mnesilochos says, 284 f., *ὦ Θράττα*,

τὴν κίστην κάθηλε, κᾶτ' ἐξελε | τὰ πόπαν', ὅπως λαβοῦσα θύσω ταῖν θεαῖν.
This evidently belongs to the lost play, the Kalligeneia. Again, Mnesilochos bids the servant withdraw, δούλοις γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστ' ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων, whereas slaves are present in the rest of the play. The λόγοι here belong to the sacrificial ceremony of the Kalligeneia; cf. Isae. de Phil. hered. 49, 3; [Dem.] Neaer. 74 ff. The senseless verse 80, ἐπεὶ τρίτη 'στὶ Θεσμοφορίων ἡ μέση is a confusion of ἐπεὶπερ ἐστὶ Θεσμοφορίων ἡ τρίτη (Kalligeneia) with ἔ. ἔ. Θ. ἡ μέση (Nesteia). Z. points out other marks of revision, dwelling especially upon the amoebaeon prayer 295 ff., which he redistributes with ingenuity; but the most important evidence is the following: At the opening of the play the Muses appear, prepared to take part in the Thesmophoria; for that the Choros (i. e. Hemichorion) which utters 104 ff. is composed of Muses is obvious from 40 f., ἐπιδημεῖ γὰρ | θιάσος μουσῶν ἐνδον μελάνθρων, and that they are to take part in the festival is shown by 101, ἱερὰν χθονίαις δεξάμεναι λαμπάδα κοῦραι. This is confirmed by a passage in the *Bios* Εὐριπίδου: λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὅτι γυναῖκες διὰ τοὺς ψόγους οὐς ἐποίει εἰς αὐτὰς διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις ἐπέστησαν αὐτῶ βουλόμεναι ἀνελεῖν · ἐφείσαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὰς Μοῦσας, ἔπειτα δὲ βεβαιωσαμένον μηκέτι αὐτὰς κακῶς ἐρεῖν. That this is one of those absurd instances of confusion of the substance of a play with historical facts, is clear; nor can there be reasonable doubt that the play in this case is the lost Thesmophorizousai, its substance, as here given, being the same as that of the extant play except as to the presence of the Muses. Now compare this with a fragment (344 K) of the Kalligeneia, μήτε Μοῦσας ἀνακαλεῖν ἑλικοβοστρήχους, | μήτε Χάριτας βοᾶν εἰς χορὸν Ὀλυμπίας · | ἐνθάδε γάρ εἰσιν, ὥς φησιν ὁ διδάσκαλος. So the Muses and the Graces were already present; and nine Muses plus three Graces make twelve Choreutai—a Hemichorion. And how appropriate, since Euripides himself says (Herc. F. 673), τὰς Χάριτας Μοῖσαις συγκαταμιγνύς, ἡδίστην συζυγίαν. In the Ravens of the Nesteia, before the ode 659 ff. stands ἡμιχόριον γυναικῶν, as if the other half-choros were *not* of women. This came over from the Kalligeneia.

The *ἀντιχορία*, thus established, points to an Agon in which the Muses and the Graces espoused the cause of Euripides, at least in so far as to save him from destruction.

The fragments of the lost play fully confirm this view in several ways, and allude to the contest; and the extant play, just like the revised *Clouds*, retains from the first play a *Keleusma* (381 f.), which is followed by trimeters.

At this point the author enters into a long and learned investigation as to the time of the performance of the Kalligeneia. He makes it tolerably clear that the Nesteia was never performed, and that the revision was never completed. It must, however, be confessed that, as in the case of the Acharnians, it is difficult to see how or where the poet would have inserted the Agon; but my statement in the article on the Agon is sustained—that we are not justified in assuming that we know of any play of the old comedy that was certainly composed without an Agon.

So far I have spoken of the author's special discussion of the Agon. We now turn to the work as a whole. Its ultimate object is to lay the foundations and furnish well prepared materials for a history of Greek comedy as distinguished from a mere history of comic authors. He holds that it is now time to cast aside the theories of ancients in the science of philology, as has long

since been done in other sciences, much less to strain their statements beyond their intended scope, as has been done by applying to comedy Aristotle's treatment of tragedy. The difference between the form of tragedy and that of comedy Z. defines as follows: "Wenn auf ein volles, aus Strophe und Antistrophe bestehendes Lied eine unbestimmte Anzahl gesprochener Verse folgt, dann wieder ein volles Lied, hierauf abermals gesprochene Verse, so haben wir es mit der *episodischen* Composition zu tun; diese ist der Tragoedie eigen. Wenn dagegen auf die Strophe des Liedes unmittelbar eine bestimmte Anzahl gesprochener Verse folgt, und dieselbe Anzahl der Antistrophe angehängt ist, so dass der ganze Abschnitt in zwei gleiche Teile zerfällt, von denen jeder von einem μέλος und einer ῥῆσις besteht, und die sich zu einander wie Strophe und Antistrophe verhalten—dann haben wir die *epirrhematiche* Composition vor uns; diese kommt in der Komödie zur Geltung."

The work is divided into two parts. In the first—"The Theory of Epirrhematic Composition"—are treated the Agon, the Parodos and Parabasis, Syzygies and Epeisodia; in the second—"The Influence of the Dance on the Form" (das Moment der Choreutik)—are treated Antichoria, Manner of Reciting, Errhythmy of Choric Odes, Eurhythmy and Symmetry.

The treatment of the Agon has already been presented; we next take up the Parodos and Parabasis. It is an error to apply to comedy what Aristotle and Anonymus XI say of tragedy. Wholly inadequate is the definition which makes the Parodos "the first passage uttered by the Choros." The Parodos of the Clouds, for instance, does not begin with v. 275, but with 263; nor does it end with 313, but 456. There may be a secondary Parodos when there is a secondary Choros, and a second Parodos when the Choros, after leaving the Orchestra, returns.

The composition of the Parodos is looser than that of the Agon, but Z. finds Odai and Epirrhema everywhere. He attempts to analyze every extant Parodos. That of the Acharnians, for instance, contains *part first*: Epirrhema (204-207), Ode (208-218), Antepirrhema (219-222), Antode (223-233), Epirrhematic (234-241); then follows an interscene (242-279); then *part second*: Kommation (280-283), Ode (284-302), Epirrhema (303-318), Antepirrhema (319-334), Antode (335-346). Here, in the very first example, we see that the definition of epirrhematic composition has to be modified; the second part (if we denote lyric passages by *a* and tetrametric by *b*) has the form *a b b a*. Most readers would see only *a b a*, and the author's separation of *b* into two parts is not wholly convincing. The analysis of the other Parodoi I omit.¹

The Thesmophoriazousai has no Parodos—proof enough that the play is incomplete. The original Parodos was probably, like that of the Frogs, an adaptation of a mystic procession with appropriate hymns, hence not epirrhematic.

¹ On Nub. 291-297, Z. says: "Hier müssen einige Verse ausgefallen sein. Denn während zu Anfang des Antepirrhemas die Wolken noch als unsichtbar gedacht werden, fragt Strepsiades im anapaestischen Gedicht, das vom Antepirrhema nur durch die Antode getrennt ist, ob sie Heroinen seien. Das setzt ihre Erscheinung voraus; aus dem Gesange allein konnte er ihr Geschlecht nicht entnehmen." One would think Strepsiades might take their word for it without demanding ocular demonstration. The Antode, which he has just heard, begins Παρθέναι ὑμφοφόροι. Moreover, their voices could be (conventionally) female. Erroneous appears also the theory that in the Parodos of the Wasps the lamp-carriers actually ran off from the Choreutai, and that ὑπαγ', ὦ παῖ, ὑπαγε is a call for them to return.

matic. Here Z. discusses at length the question of the second performance of the Frogs, finding many marks of a revision, that is a *διόρθωσις*, not a *διασκευή*.

The classification of Parodoi might be based upon the rhythm, which is adapted to the substance, some being trochaic, some iambic, some anapaestic. A complex Parodos, like that of the Wasps, may vary its rhythm.

Another basis of classification might be the arrangement of the Odai and Epirrhemata. Some Parodoi, like the Agon, have the form *a b a b*, as Vesp. II and III, Lys. I, Eccl. II: some, the form *b a b a*, as Acharn. I, Nub. I, Eccl. I; some, by chiasm, *a b b a*, as Acharn. II, and *b a a b*, as Pax; finally *b b a a* occurs in Vesp. I. The remaining possible form *a a b b* does not occur.

In the Agon only actors can take part in the Epirrhemata; in the Parabasis only Choreutai; in the Parodos, both may take part, though originally only Choreutai could take part. The change probably occurred with the introduction of the Prologue.

Down to B. C. 422, that is, in Acharn., Equit., Nub., the Choros enters and remains in the Orchestra during the Parodos. From B. C. 422 to 405, that is, in Vesp., Pax, Av., Lys., and Ran., the Parodos included an *ἀνοδος* to the Logeion, and a *κάθοδος*. From B. C. 405 on, that is, in Eccl., Plut., the Choros is again restricted to the Orchestra.

In the Parodos the Pnigos is rare, and still more the Katakeleusmos (borrowed probably from the Agon). Proodic and mesodic verses occur as in the Agon, subject to the same metrical restrictions. The Epirrhematic occurs, but has the metre of Epirrhemata, not the iambic trimeter as in the Agon.

In some plays a sort of Parodos is provided for important actors, as Equit. 1316-1334.

The Parabasis has been more fully explored by previous writers. To the seven usually recognized parts, our author adds another Pnigos and an Antipnigos, of course as *ἐκθέσεις* to the Epirrhema and Antepirrhema. No Parabasis exhibits all the nine parts. In Pax 1127-1190 are found the Pnige.

In the history of the Parabasis three periods may be noted: 1. The first six plays have a chief Parabasis with *ἀπλᾶ* and Syzygy, and a secondary Parabasis consisting of a Syzygy without *ἀπλᾶ*. 2. From B. C. 414 to 404, three plays exhibit each only one more or less defective Parabasis. 3. After 404, two plays exhibit no Parabasis at all. In this period the Agon contains a simple *Epicheiresis*, and the Choros is restricted to the Orchestra.

The Parabasis having originally been a sort of epilogue to the play, the later Exodos never received a full development. An analysis of the Exodoi yields no results except that they are composed in a long metre, and the nature of the *ἐξόδια* marks three periods: 1. when the *ἐξόδια* were existing familiar hymns; 2. B. C. 422-413, when the poet composed *ἐξόδια* of his own; 3. when the old usage was resumed.

In the third chapter the author discusses the extension of epirrhematic composition beyond the limits of the Parodos, Agon, and Parabasis. Three different kinds of composition are found. First, there are Syzygies in which the Ode and Antode occur as in the Parabasis, but the Epirrhemata are parallel scenes in iambic trimeters; and even the parallelism sometimes vanishes. Secondly, the epirrhematic composition is abandoned, and Epeisodia, alternating with Stasima, appear. There is no Epodos, because of the organi-

zation of the comic Choros, to be discussed in the sequel. Thirdly, the Interscene, a sort of Epeisodion without Chorikon, is sometimes employed.

At this point the author gives a complete analysis of all the plays of Aristophanes. As a sample I give that of the Knights: Vv. 1-241 Prologue, 242-302 Parados, 303-460 secondary Agon, 461-497 Interscene, 498-610 Parabasis, 611-755 Syzygy, 756-940 Agon, 941-972 Epeisodion I, 973-996 Stasimon I, 997-1110 Epeisodion II, 1111-1150 Stasimon II, 1151-1262 Epeisodion III, 1263-1315 secondary Parabasis, 1316 ff. Exodos.

Epeisodia occur only after the Parabasis. The Interscene was probably introduced to give the Choros a rest between the Parodos (originally recited entirely by the Choros) and the Ode of the Agon. As the Antepirrhema and Antipnigos of the Agon were recited by actors, the Choros indeed rested, but the flute-player did not; hence the Epirrhematic (*δάλυσσις*) to give him time to catch his breath. Here it seems to me there is too much refinement.

Comedy, then, had some parts that were characteristic of tragedy; did tragedy, in like manner, admit any epirrhematic passages? The author finds Syzygies representing Stasima, and Syzygies representing Epeisodia. The phenomenon does not appear in Euripides. The two species of drama, according to Z., did not borrow these features from each other. The question, in its relation to tragedy, he does not discuss; but the Epeisodia of comedy were due to a fusion of the Doric (episodic) with the Ionic (epirrhematic) comedy. As in architecture, and otherwise, the Athenians combined characteristics of both races, so in comedy are seen the effects of the Doric lyre and the Ionian flute. An ingenious but rather fanciful origin of Ode and Epirrhema from a flute contest is here proposed.¹

The first chapter of the second part treats of *ἀντιχορία*. First are investigated some of the theories as to the portion of the Choros that sung or recited the different choric parts, but especially the "Einzelchoreuten" theory of R. Arnoldt is combated.²

Z. sets up this law: *A single Choreutes may be represented by an actor, the whole Choros never*; that is, in passages which correspond to each other, if the Choros appears in one, and an actor at the same place in the other, "Choros" means a single Choreutes. This occurs in the *γεφύρισμοί* in the Parodos of the Frogs; cf. also Acharn. 929-939 = 940-951. Further, in the Agon the Katakeleusmoi belong in form to the Epirrhemata (recited by actors), and hence must have been uttered by one Choreutes. It is thus rendered probable that the Epirrhemata in other parts of a play were recited by single Choreutai, when they belong to the Choros.

But who sang the Odai? In tragedy there are Strophe and Antistrophe, implying movement and countermovement of the same persons; and then there is Epodos. In comedy there are *ᾠδή* and *ἀντᾠδή*, without Epodos, and it is

¹ I do not understand the notion that in the song of the Chelidonizontes (Bergk, Poet. Lyr. III, p. 671) a certain part bears marks of improvisation, and if improvised, must have been sung by only one. Did it come to us through a stenographer?

² Unfortunately, in the midst of his triumph over Arnoldt, he exclaims, "Aber sollte es R. Arnoldt wirklich entgangsein, dass der Gebrauch von *νῆ Δία* in negativen Sätzen absolut ungrischisch ist?" The examples known to me, some of which are nowhere cited, are: Pax 218, Thesm. 551, 640, Lys. 360; Diphil. 32. 25; Antiph. 158. 6; Philetaer. 4; Plat. Theag. 130 B (*νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς*). Some of these may be doubtful, and some due to special causes; but it is not possible to explain all away.

obvious that *ᾄδων* and *ἀντᾄδων* have reference to different sets of singers. Moreover, it is attested that in the *διπλᾶ* of the Parabasis the Choreutai arranged themselves *ἀντιπρόσωπον ἀλλήλοις*. Hence the Ode belongs to the first Hemichorion, the Epirrhema to its leader (Koryphaos); the Antode to the second Hemichorion, the Antepirrhema to its leader. For the relative position of the Hemichoria, cf. Av. 352 f., Equit. 243. Such is Antichoria. Here Z. gives several further illustrations, and discusses the attitude of the Choros in Lysistrate, where there is *διχορία*. He finds double Antichoria; but in the Agon, of course, ordinary Antichoria. In Ekklesiazousai there seems to have been but one Hemichorion: all the parts are single, and in the second Parodos the Epirrhemation is divided between the Choros and an actor (Praxagora). In Plutos only the Koryphaos is a singer; hence in the Parodos, the Antodai are sung by an actor (Karion).

Where there are Stasima in comedy, Antichoria is still to be assumed. Before Sophokles a Choros consisted of twelve members. In comedy two such Choroï, called Hemichoria, were employed for the sake of Antichoria. The superiority of the comic to the tragic Choros was only apparent; but it would have been real if there had been no Antichoria in the Stasima of comedy. In some exceptional cases, however, such as the Ode Av. 400-405, and Exodia generally, the whole Choros seems to have sung.

From this theory naturally flows another: in tragedy there was no Antichoria. The author maintains that HMIX. in the MSS of tragedy means the Koryphaos or a single Choreutes. At this point C. Muff and O. Hense pass under review, and their doctrines are condemned. The nearest we have to Antichoria is in Aischylos, first in Suppl. 1018 ff., where it is Dichoria analogous to that in Lysistrate, which is there combined with Antichoria; then in the Exodos of Eumen. we find Dichoria, and finally in the Exodos of Theb. Numerous details I omit here, as elsewhere.

The manner of reciting (Vortragsweise) is discussed in the next chapter. Here are to be found many combinations revealing great acuteness and penetration on the part of the author; and if to me the conclusions do not in all cases seem secure, that may be due to my want of familiarity with the subject.

The author finds in the Attic comedy all the four types of our day: song, recitative, melodrama, conversation. The melodramatic type, a recent creation in modern times, was at Athens created between Archilochos and Aris- tophanes.

The style of recitation is closely related to the form of verse and the structure of passages. Metrically comedy contains *υέλη* and *ἐπη*; as to structure it contains Odai and Epirrhemata. But *μέλη* and *ἐπη* do not correspond respectively with Odai and Epirrhemata; for *μέλη*, in addition to pure lyric verse, include what Z. calls the Ionic Strophe, composed in iambotrochaic or (anaclastic) Ionic rhythm, and this same rhythm may be used in Epirrhemata as well as in Odai. That is, *μέλη* include Doric Strophe and Ionic Strophe; *ἐπη* include Epe proper (tetrameters and dimeters) and trimeters; while Odai include Doric Strophe and Ionic Strophe in part, and Epirrhemata include trimeters, Epe proper, and Ionic Strophe in part.

A difference in the style of recitation was accompanied by a difference in metrical treatment of the same verse. For instance, when the Choros recites iambic trimeters, these are *ἐπη* as in tragedy, not *ψυλλῇ λέξις*, and they have the

tragic structure. The neglect of Porson's law I have spoken of elsewhere. The treatment of the iambic tetrameter is analogous. So the trochaic tetrameter, which exhibits but two types, the other verses mentioned exhibiting three. The anapaestic tetrameter has but one form. Here I must pass over an interesting discussion of the three types of iambic tetrameter, and the difference between the trimeters as $\epsilon\pi\eta$ in tragedy and as $\psi\iota\lambda\lambda\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\varsigma$ in comedy. Whenever in comedy we hear of $\epsilon\pi\eta$, tetrameters are meant.

In the third chapter of the second part is discussed Errhythmia of the choric odes. Here the author points out the differences between Aeolo-Doric and Ionic composition, in Harmony, in Rhythmic, and in Structure. He enumerates all the Ionic Strophai of Aristophanes, and discusses also the Doric. In the former Errhythmia—uniformity of rhythm—is invariably found; in the latter the exceptions are limited, and the *μεταβολαί* due to special causes.

An examination of the choric parts of all the plays leads to the following conclusions: 1. Errhythmia is maintained not only through each choric passage, but throughout the choric passages of each play. 2. The revision of a play always affects the music, and so the rhythm. This may be utilized in determining what is old and what is new in the case of a play, such as the Clouds, whose revision was not completed.

The secondary Parodoi have a special law: they occur only when the main Parodos is trochaic, and they must be in Ionic rhythm.

In the last chapter of this part are discussed Eurhythmia and Symmetry. The investigation begins with the Parabasis. As the tetrameter has four bars, so four verses make a Strophe, and four Strophai a Perikope (16 verses). In the Parabasis the Epirrhemata ordinarily have this number of verses, but sometimes eight and sometimes twenty. The Epirrhema and Antepirrhema have the same number, that is, the music repeats.

In the Parodos the sailing is not so plain. In Acharnians I all is normal. In Acharnians II, vv. 303–334 are divided into two Perikopai, hence *a b b a*. In Equit. 242–283 there is some trouble. In the Clouds a strange phenomenon occurs. The tetrameters of the Parodos, though not at all symmetrically divided by the lyric passages, still number 144—nine Perikopai. To omit the intervening Parodoi, we find also in Av. 268–386 that the tetrameters are not symmetrically divided by the chorika, but still number just 96—six Perikopai. On these facts Z. remarks: "Hier einen Zufall sehen wollen hiesse für jede philologische Combination den Boden entziehen. Schon für einmal wäre es höchst seltsam, wenn die Teilbarkeit durch eine so grosse Einheit, wie die Zahl 16 es ist, auf Zufall beruhen sollte; für zwei derartige Fälle ist es einfach unmöglich." With this I must take issue. For one instance the chance is 1 in 16; for two, 1 in 256, and 256 is far from infinity. But nothing convinces like examples; so I give a few. The idea enters my head that Aristophanes wrote his entire plays by sixteens. I turn to Dindorf's text (the one I always use) and find in the first play, the Acharnians, that the number is $1232 = 77 \times 16$ —seventy-seven Perikopai. "Schon für einmal wäre es höchst seltsam," u. s. w. I try the next play, the Knights, and find $1408 = 88 \times 16$ —eighty-eight Perikopai! The law is proved, and we need not examine any further, for "für zwei derartige Fälle ist es einfach unmöglich." The hypothesis to Oidipous Tyrannos contains 16 verses; the Oracle, the Riddle, and the Solution together make another Perikope. The Prologos of the Frogs contains 208 verses =

13 × 16, the Embaterion of the Persians 64, that of Agamemnon 64. That all these coincidences are due to chance is demonstrable.

The Agon is still more stubborn. Eight Epirrhemata with their eight Antepirrhemata are indivisible by 16, and in only one instance of these eight is the number in the Epirrhema the same as that in the Antepirrhema. A panacea is found. All the figures are expanded to the next higher multiple of 16, by assuming a pause in the recitation while the music continued. In one or two cases this seems plausible, in some highly improbable. In the Knights II 68 is in this way expanded to 80, and in the Wasps pauses amounting to 11 tetrameters are necessary. I do not deny the possibility of this; but it is the least satisfactory part of the whole work. And yet, according to Z., the whole theory of epirrhematic composition depends upon the correspondence of Epirrhema and Antepirrhema. It seems to me possible that there should be a correspondence of another sort, which I shall not discuss here. In any case it appears to me that there is an obstacle to exact musical correspondence: sometimes the Epirrhema and Antepirrhema are in different rhythms, anapaestic and iambic, or *vice versa*.¹

The Pnigos of the Parodos shows neither Eurhythmy nor Symmetry, while that of the Parabasis shows Symmetry. In the Agon it shows Symmetry in some cases. In the *παράβασις* proper—the Anapaests—there is no Symmetry. The author challenges any one to produce Symmetry here as readily as he has done it in the epirrhematic parts.

Likewise in the Syzygies, where there is no dance, there is no trace of Eurhythmy or Symmetry.

The work closes with an adverse criticism of the “grosse Responson” theory. At the end are lithographs in the form of spectra, presenting clearly to the eye the complete analysis of several tragedies and comedies.

In my article on the Agon I characterized Zieliński's work as one of great importance. The perusal of several adverse reviews by German scholars has not changed my opinion. That the book contains numerous errors in details, I intimated in that article, and it must be conceded that the tone is rather vigorously polemic, and the self-confidence sometimes too great for security; but it would be an easy matter to point out worse errors in some of the adverse criticisms of the work than in the work itself. Yet it is proper to state that I have not called attention to all the errors I observed, but have merely noted a sufficient proportion of them. To enumerate all the errors and give one-tenth of the truths would make on readers who have not seen it a false impression in regard to the merits of a book which, in my opinion, is destined to create an epoch in the study of the Greek drama.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. Part I. The Archaic Inscriptions and the Greek Alphabet; edited for the Syndics of the University Press by E. S. ROBERTS, M. A. Cambridge, 1887. xxii, 419 pp.

Not the least service rendered the science of Greek epigraphy by Sir Charles Newton, the eminent keeper of the antiquities of the British Museum, was

¹The theory does not demand that the Epirrhema and Antepirrhema should necessarily have the same number of verses, but should each be made up of even Perikopai so that the same music could be used; but the rhythm surely could not change.